

Remarks

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3 and 6-18 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1 and 14-15 and has cancelled claims 4-5 and 19-20. The Applicant has not added any new claims in this Amendment.

The Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because empty boxes should be labeled as to their proper function. The Applicant has amended the drawings accordingly.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 5 and 20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 depends on claim 4 which depends on independent claim 1. The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of claims 4-5. As such, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be in a condition for allowance. Claims 2-3 and 6-13 depend from amended independent claim 1 and include the limitations therein. Thus, claims 1-3 and 6-13 are believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Claim 20 depends on claim 19 which depends on independent claim 15. The Applicant has amended independent claim 15 to include the limitations of claims 19-20. As such, amended independent claim 15 is believed to be in a condition for allowance. Claims 16-18 depend from amended independent claim 19 and include the limitations therein. Thus, claims 15-18 are believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Independent claim 14 is generally similar to independent claim 1, but recites two switching elements as opposed to at least one switching element. The Applicant has amended independent claim 14 to include the limitations of claims 4-5. As such, amended independent claim 14 is believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,003,192 issued to Beigel et al. ("Beigel"). This rejection is now moot in view of the claim amendments as indicated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beigel in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,731,763 issued to Herweck et al. The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beigel. These rejections are now moot in view of the claim amendments as indicated above.

CONCLUSION

In summary, claims 1-3 and 6-18, as amended, meet the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

HANS MARTIN VON STAUDT

By 

James N. Kallis
Reg. No. 41,102
Attorney for Applicant

Date: October 15, 2003

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351